

ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action mailed November 23, 2007 has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, Claims 4, 5, 12 and 22 stand rejected. In addition, Claims 3, 7-11, 13-15 and 19-21 have been allowed. The Applicant has cancelled Claims 12 and has amended Claims 4, 19 and 22. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claim in continuation and/or divisional applications. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Informal Objections

Within the Office Action, Claim 19 was objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis. Applicant does not believe that Claim 19, as is stands, fails to provide improper antecedent basis as the first axis is distinguishable from the first horizontal axis, and the second axis is distinguishable from the second horizontal axis. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended Claim 19 to remove the first and second horizontal axis language and now state that the first axis is horizontally oriented and the second axis is horizontally oriented. This amendment merely replaces the current language with the same limitation and does not add limitations which would require a new search. Additionally, the term “said” has been added to Claim 19 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

Within the Office Action Claims 4, 5, 12, and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC. § 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs. The Applicant has cancelled Claim 12 and has amended Claims 4 and 22. In particular, Claim 4 has been amended to now recite, “The assembly according to claim 3, in


which each of the two plates of the suspended structure cooperate with the load bearing structure through spherical surfaces together defining a ball joint connection therebetween” In addition, Claim 22 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “the suspended structure including two plates parallel to each other and configured to receive the load bearing structure therebetween, wherein each of the two plates of the suspended structure cooperate with the load bearing structure through spherical surfaces together defining a ball joint connection therebetween.” For at least these reasons, Claims 4, 5 and 22 are allowable. The Applicant accordingly submits the rejections have now been overcome and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that this response places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of the application is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/26/07


Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040